REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated December 7, 2009, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-15, 17-33, 35-37 and 39 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1-4, 19-23, 25-30, 32 and 39 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I.   Interview Summary

The Applicants thank Examiner Marandi and his supervisor for granting the interview conducted on February 19, 2010 with the Applicants' representative. During the interview, the distinguishable features between the present invention (as recited in independent claim 1) and the cited prior art were discussed in more detail.

It was noted that, in the present invention (as recited in independent claim 1), a program is extracted based on the user's profile information and the program content attributes are displayed as a recommended program, when the user does not intend to search for a program. Additionally, a "recommendation reason" is also displayed.

Conversely, it was noted that the indicator described in Defreeze simply indicates the attributes of a program, and it is displayed when the user directly operates the same with the intention of searching for a program.

Additionally, during the interview, proposed claim amendments for independent claim 1 were also discussed. At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner indicated that the proposed claim amendments would likely distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art.

In particular, it was agreed that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least "generating, for each recommended program, as a recommendation reason, an extraction condition for the recommended program which has been extracted based on the profile information and the content attributes in said extracting step, wherein in said displaying step, the notification screen also includes a recommendation reason."

II.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 7, 9-12, 14, 17, 19-21, 25, 27-30, 32, 35, 37 and 39 have

been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (U.S. Patent No. 7,185,355, hereafter "Ellis") in view of DeFreese et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,876, hereafter "DeFreese").

The Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 19 and 39 to more clearly distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. The amendments to independent claims 1, 19 and 39 are consistent with the claim amendments proposed to the Examiner during the interview conducted on February 19, 2010 (hereafter "interview"). Claim 1, as amended, recites the following features:

"[a] recommended program notification method of notifying a user of a recommended program, comprising the steps of:

inputting a user's instruction including a recommendation control instruction;

storing attributes of program contents;

storing a profile that is information indicating preference of the user;

extracting a recommended program, based on the stored content attributes and the stored profile, when the recommendation control instruction is not input;

detecting notification timing with which a notification of the recommended program, which has been extracted in the recommended program extracting step, is performed, when the recommendation control instruction is not input;

displaying a notification screen indicating the existence of <u>the</u> recommended program when the notification timing is detected; and

<u>generating, for each recommended program, as a recommendation reason, an extraction condition for the recommended program which has been extracted based on the profile information and the content attributes in said extracting step,</u>

<u>wherein in said displaying step, the notification screen also includes the generated recommendation reason</u> ." (Emphasis added).

The features emphasized above in independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claims 19 and 39 (as amended). Additionally, the features emphasized above in independent claim 1 (and similarly recited in independent claims 19 and 39) are fully supported

by the Applicants' disclosure (see e.g., 17C and Fig. 18).

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Ellis in view of DeFreese for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in at least independent claims 1, 19 and 39. However, the Examiner relies primarily on DeFreese for disclosing or suggesting a recommendation condition (i.e., which corresponds to the recommended program) that is included in a notification screen.

However, as noted above, independent claims 1, 19 and 39 have been amended to indicate that for each recommended program, as a recommendation reason, an extraction condition is generated for the recommended program which has been extracted based on the profile information and the content attributes. Additionally, a notification screen is displayed that includes the generated recommendation reason.

In the present invention (as recited in independent claims 1, 19 and 39), a program is extracted based on the user's profile information and the program content attributes are displayed as a recommended program, when the user does not intend to search for a program.

Automatic display of a recommended program results in a problem that the user does not know the reason why the program is recommended (as noted in the Applicants' disclosure). In order to solve this problem, in the present invention (as recited in independent claims 1, 19 and 39) the "recommendation reason" is displayed.

As noted during the interview, DeFreese fails to discloses or suggest the above features now recited in independent claims 1, 19 and 39.

DeFreese discloses a cable system that incorporates digital and analog transmission architecture capable of delivering a high number of high quality television programs, advanced cable services, and online services to a subscriber's home. Specifically, a set-top terminal provides advanced cable services such as a comprehensive channel navigator, an interactive program guide, impulse Pay-Per-View activation, Near-Video-On-Demand and Video-On-Demand programming, and advanced configuration controls.

As agreed during the interview, DeFreese merely discloses or suggests that "[b]y highlighting a desired program in program list 432, information for that program may be displayed to the subscriber." (See Fig. 21). Thus, DeFreese, at best, discloses or suggests an indicator that simply

13

indicates the attributes of a program, and it is displayed when the user directly operates the same with the intention of searching for a program.

On the other hand, in the present invention (as recited in independent claims 1, 19 and 39), a program is extracted based on the user's profile information and the program content attributes is displayed as a recommended program (along with a recommendation reason), when the user does not intend to search for a program.

DeFreese fails to disclose or suggest that for each recommended program, as a recommendation reason, an extraction condition is generated for the recommended program which has been extracted based on the profile information and the content attributes, wherein a notification screen is displayed that also includes the generated recommendation reason (as recited in independent claims 1, 19 and 29).

Moreover, Ellis fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in DeFreese. Accordingly, no combination of Ellis and DeFreese would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claims 1, 19 and 39 (as amended). Likewise, no combination of Ellis and DeFreese would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 2, 3, 7, 9-12, 14, 17, 20, 21, 25, 27-30, 32, 35 and 37 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 19.

In the Office Action, claims 4-6, 8, 22-24 and 26 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of DeFreese, and further in view of Schein (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,369, hereafter "Schein"); and claims 13, 15, 18, 31, 33 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of DeFreese, and further in view of Wagner (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,736, hereafter "Wagner").

Claims 4-6, 8, 13, 15 and 18 depend from independent claim 1; and claims 22-24, 26, 31, 33 and 36 depend from independent claim 19. As noted above, Ellis and DeFreese fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1 and 19 (as amended). Additionally, Schein and Wagner fail to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Ellis and DeFreeze. Accordingly, no combination of Ellis and DeFreeze with Schein or Wagner would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 4-6, 8, 13, 15, 18, 22-24, 26, 31, 33 and 36 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 19.

III.   Conclusion

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectively request that the Examiner withdraw the objections and rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the present application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitsuteru KATAOKA

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: 2010.02.26 13:39:25 -05'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45794
Attorney for Applicant

MDP/ats/ekb
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 26, 2010